



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,665	01/24/2001	Tuyet-Huong Thi Nguyen	016295.0624	3786

7590 04/04/2005

Roger Fulghum  
Baker & Butts, L.L.P.  
One Shell Plaza  
910 Louisiana  
Houston, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER

KING, JUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/768,665	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Justin I. King	2111	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,16 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,16 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 4-8, 16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,601) and Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,643,227).

Referring to claim 1: The admitted prior art discloses writing parameters for the SMI routines to a predetermined register of a first processor (Specification, page 3, lines 4-6), executing in the first processor a command of a software application to cause the first processor to initiate a system management interrupt (Specification, page 2, lines 8-17), receiving at each processor an instruction that the system management interrupt has been issued (Specification, page 2, lines 19-20), entering system management mode at each processor (Specification, page 2,

Art Unit: 2111

lines 20-21), and saving register contents of each processor to a memory space associated with each respective processor (Specification, page 2, lines 22-24). The admitted prior art's parameters for the SMI routines are the claimed predetermined signature.

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page 3, lines 13-16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler.

But the admitted prior art does not disclose selecting the second processor according to an arbitration scheme. The admitted prior art also does not disclose scanning the content of the memory for the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment. Goodman discloses scanning the contents of the memory space associated with each processor (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt (figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2, lines 1-5).

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task according to the processor's current workload

Referring to claim 4: Claim 1's argument applies; furthermore, since Smith teaches one to select the processor based on the workload; it can be any processor, including the one just causes the SMI.

Referring to claim 5: The admitted prior art discloses the processors' access to chip set's I/O port as one standard well-known system activities (Application, page 3, lines 8-9). Goodman also discloses that the processor writes to the memory (figure 1, structure 26) via the chip set's port (figure 1, structure 18).

Referring to claims 6-7: Both the admitted prior art (Specification, page 2, line 11) and Goodman (figure 1, structure 50) disclose the chip sets as a PCI bridge.

Referring to claim 8: The admitted prior art discloses the step of issuing from the expansion bridge the instruction causing the processor to enter the system management mode (Specification, page 2, lines 10-17). Goodman discloses that each of the processors of the system to enter system management mode (column 1, lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 16: The admitted prior art discloses issuing an instruction from a first processor of the system to a chip set (Specification, page 2, lines 10-11), receiving the instruction at the chip set and in response issuing a command causing the processors to enter system management mode (Specification, page 2, lines 12 and 18-19), writing parameters for the SMI

Art Unit: 2111

routines to a predetermined register of a first processor (Specification, page 3, lines 4-6), and saving register contents of each processor to a memory space associated with each respective processor (Specification, page 2, lines 22-24). The admitted prior art's parameters for the SMI routines are the claimed predetermined signature.

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page 3, lines 13-16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler and then transmitting the software system management interrupt to the selected second processor.

But the admitted prior art does not disclose selecting the second processor according to an arbitration scheme. The admitted prior art also does not disclose retrieving the content of the memory for the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment. Goodman discloses scanning the contents of the memory space associated with each processor (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt (figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2, lines 1-5).

Art Unit: 2111

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task according to the processor's current workload.

Referring to claim 19: The admitted prior art discloses the processors' access to chip set's I/O port as one standard well-known system activities (Application, page 3, lines 8-9). Goodman also discloses that the processor writes to the memory (figure 1, structure 26) via the chip set's port (figure 1, structure 18).

Referring to claims 20-21: Both the admitted prior art (Specification, page 2, line 11) and Goodman (figure 1, structure 50) disclose the chip sets as a PCI bridge.

Referring to claims 22-23: The admitted prior art discloses receiving at each processor an instruction that the system management interrupt has been issued (Specification, page 2, lines 19-20) and entering system management mode at each processor (Specification, page 2, lines 20-21).

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page 3, lines 13-16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler.

But the admitted prior art does not disclose selecting the second processor according to an arbitration scheme. The admitted prior art also does not disclose scanning, locating, and retrieving the content of the memory for the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment. Goodman discloses scanning the contents of the memory space associated with each processor (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt (figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2, lines 1-5).

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task according to the processor's current workload

***Response to Arguments***

4. In response to any of Applicant's arguments regarding the prior arts Tyner and Inoue: The arguments are in moot in view of the new Rejections stated above without incorporating either Tyner or Inoue.

5. In response to Applicant's argument that Goodman only has the boot processor handling the system management interrupt (Remark, page 8, last 2 lines); thus, it teaches away from the claimed invention (Remark, pages 10-11, Section 4): In the 103(a) Rejection stated above, the admitted prior art discloses that multiple processors are each able to handle the system management interrupt. The 103(a) Rejection only applies the teaching of the Goodman's signature scanning; such teaching of the signature scanning does not teach away from the claimed invention.

6. In response to Applicant's argument that Smith does not disclose or teach in any manner concerning system management interrupts (SMI) or a computer system in which multiple processors are each able to handle the SMI (Remark, page 10, Section 3, last 3 lines): The 103(a) Rejection above applies only the teaching of the Smith's task distribution among processors according to an arbitration scheme. The admitted prior art discloses the manner concerning the SMI; the admitted prior art discloses that multiple processors are each able to handle the SMI.

***Conclusion***


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin I. King whose telephone number is 571-272-3628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632 or on the central telephone number, (571) 272-2100. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will cease to be mailed to applicants with Office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of foreign patents and non-patent literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests

Art Unit: 2111

to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. patent or patent application publications  
will not be granted.



Justin King  
March 28, 2005



MARK H. RINEHART  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100